

**Minutes**  
**FRPR meeting, Dec. 12, 2019, 1:00 p.m.**  
**University Governance Office, 33 Strong Hall**

Attending: Joseph Harrington (Chair); Patricia Gaston; Chris Crandall; Dale Urie; Lawrence Davidow; Nils Gore

Absent: Emma Scioli

Minutes of Nov. 6 meeting were approved without changes or additions

The Chair updated the committee on the amendment to FSRR Article VII to extend the time limit for filing an Appeal of Administrative Action to FRB, from 14 to 30 days: it was passed by FacEx and will have first reading before the Faculty Senate at its Feb. 6, 2020 meeting. The “Know Your Rights” has been approved by FacEx, with clarifications.

**1. Working Group on Online Evaluations & Privacy.** Davidow recapped meeting with CTE director Doug Ward and FacEx/SenEx member Cambrey Nguyen (see report below). How to prevent intermixing of instructor evaluations and course evaluations? How to regulate manner in which they may be used and who should be permitted to see each? Need for written policies governing use of online evals with eXplorance system. Proposal to establish ad hoc working group to examine implications and solutions, to be composed of Davidow, Ward, Nguyen, and Laura Modey of CODL. Motion to endorse working group and appoint Davidow as FRPR representative. Approved.

**2. FSRR Article X amendment** (interim appointments). Harrington explained that a previous version was passed by Uni Sen but rejected by Admin. Based on feedback from Provost, Harrington drafted amendment that would limit interim administrators to 24 months in office; Uni Sen or the representative assemblies of the various schools/College/Libraries, as appropriate, could extend for another 12 months. Could they approve a shorter extension? Would the interim be limited to only 1 additional 12-month term? General sentiment was that 36 months should be the absolute limit; permanent hire must be made by that time. Revisions: job titles should be placed at beginnings of sentences for clarity’s sake. Preamble should be added indicating undesirability of interim appointments in general. Harrington agreed to make changes and circulate revised draft electronically for committee review and approval.

**3. FSRR Article V amendment** (faculty control of curriculum). Harrington explained that a previous version was passed by Fac Sen but rejected by Admin. Based on feedback from Provost, Harrington drafted shorter amendment, focused solely on curriculum and quoting the apposite words from AAU Statement on Academic Principles. Departmental administrators have purview over curriculum, but not higher-up administrators. Crandall: very important issue, vis-à-vis Core. Perhaps quote AAUP Statement on Governance, w.r.t. faculty control of teaching subject-matter and methods? Davidow: Reverse the order of sentences? Motion to charge

Harrington with making said changes and forward amendment to FacEx. Approved.

**4. Discussion of research on NTTF policies at other schools.** Harrington reported that he has not received data from all the committee members who undertook it; some came in the morning of the meeting date; still others in the form of raw data. Crandall mentioned Michigan's NTTF contract (190 pp.) as model of clarity. He also recommended consolidating various schools' policy documents in a centralized location for use later. Harrington offered to collate info, analyze, and put in legible shape, for review by committee members over break.

**5. Determining governance role in New Budget Model.** Harrington reported that he received re-written charge from FacEx (per FRPR request): "Recommend what a budget process should look like and how it should work." Discussion ensued. Root issue is role for faculty governance in budget process (if any). Davidow: still an issue of metrics: which used, what data is counted (e.g., student-credit hours)? Urie: are we talking about University level budget, or that of the several schools? Harrington: University. Urie: Perhaps this is something better attempted by the representative bodies of the respective schools/College/Libraries? Chair floated the idea of a "Budget Commission" with representatives of stakeholder groups – or some other policy framework to ensure representation of faculty, students, staff while the budget is being deliberated and decided upon, not after; transparency, accountability crucial. Crandall feared such a body would be coopted by deans and suggested the desirability of having accounting professors serve – i.e., people who will know what they are looking at. He also suggested researching other institutions' approach: do they bring non-administrators into the process and if so, how? Members agreed to continue considering the issue over winter break.

There was no unfinished business or new business. Meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Patricia Gaston  
Joe Harrington

---

### **Working Group on Online Evaluations & Privacy**

WRT our (new) **Charge 5**: "Examine the distinction between instructor evaluations and course evaluations, and how they may be treated in certain contexts. One issue would be the common situation of a course that is taught by only one instructor, leading to a situation where course evaluations are clearly linked to a specific instructor. Establish best practices for balancing the curricular needs of a school and the privacy rights of instructor. (Added October 3, 2019)"

**Possible Action:**

Endorse the formation of the ad-hoc working group on online evaluations & privacy, as described below. Approve Larry Davidow as FRPR representative on said working group.

**Rationale:**

Larry Davidow submitted the following report on Dec. 2 (via e-mail):

As the FRPR representative, I met with Doug Ward (CTE) and Cambrey Nguyen (University Senate Representative) at the CTE on Monday, 12/2 at 10:30 AM. We discussed concerns relating to a lack of policies defining access to and use of data obtained from electronic student evaluations of teaching using the eXplorance Blue course evaluation system. Concerns raised included who had access to run, collect and redistribute reports, as well as what data should be shared with faculty, their direct supervisors, unit administrators, and ultimately university administrators. We all agreed that the information obtained from student evaluation of teaching has limitations and could be incorrectly used in contexts outside of the stated purposes on the CODL website (“...administrators and committees who are directly responsible for making individual staff decisions, such as reappointment, discipline, promotion, tenure, and salary...”). For example, can this electronic database be used by Analytics & Institutional Research Department to obtain metrics for use in the budget model? We felt that without written policy and procedures regarding data access and use, this type of question cannot be answered. We concluded that, if approved by the FRPR committee, further consideration and development of these policies should be undertaken (at least initially) by the following faculty stakeholders: A) University Senate Representative – Cambrey Nguyen, B) Faculty Rights, Privileges, and Responsibilities (FRPR) Representative – Lawrence Davidow, C) Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) – Douglas Ward, D) KU Center for Online and Distance Learning (CODL) – Laura Moley. Doug Ward also agreed to start looking to see if there are similar policies at other universities.